UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/827,566	04/19/2004	Virinder Mohan Batra	CHA920040004US1	3188

23550   7590   07/03/2008
HOFFMAN WARNICK LLC
75 STATE STREET
14TH FLOOR
ALBANY, NY 12207

EXAMINER
GORTAYO, DANGELINO N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2168	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/03/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTOCommunications@hwdpatents.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action ***Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief***	10/827,566	BATRA ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	DANGELINO N. GORTAYO	2168	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED <u>30 May 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

   a) ☒ The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

   b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

   Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

<u>NOTICE OF APPEAL</u>

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

<u>AMENDMENTS</u>

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because

   (a)☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

   (b)☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);

   (c)☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

   (d)☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

   NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

   The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

   Claim(s) allowed: _____.

   Claim(s) objected to: _____.

   Claim(s) rejected: _____.

   Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

<u>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</u>

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

<u>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</u>

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u>

12. ☐ Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement*(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____

13. ☐ Other: _____.

/Tim T. Vo/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2168

/Dangelino N Gortayo/
Examiner, Art Unit 2168

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In regards to the rejection of claims 1-6, 8-14, 16-18, and 20 under 35 USC 102(b), Examiner respectfully disagrees. Applicant's argument is stated as Farmer does not teach a database for storing a list of available Web services. As disclosed in the previous office action, in paragraph 0018, 0022, and 0051, and additionally in paragraphs 0045, 0046 and 0050, a service broker is in communication with service providers, which registers the services so that the services from different resources can be used interchangeably without perurbing the system. As stated in paragraph 0036, different software tools and services are accessible by the prior art of Farmer through the unified environment, storing, registering, and processing service requests through a proxy.

As to the argument that Farmer does not disclose a selecting system for forming the chain of Web services by selecting a Web service form the list of available Web services for each of a plurality of tasks in the workflow, examiner respectfully disagrees. An example of the workflow as an integrated data model composed of a plurality of tasks and services are disclosed in Figure 11 and paragraph 0073. As disclosed in the previously cited section, paragraphs 0053, 0060, 0061, 0062, and 0063 is methods to link together the different services, the linking accomplished by the IS platform which the user interacts with (paragraph 0040, 0041). More specifically, paragraphs 0053, 0056, 0057, and 0060 disclose how searches are made based on particular classes and attributes, as determined by a user.

As to the argument that the selecting sysem dynamically matches the input signature of a first web service with the specified input of the workflow and the output signature of the first web service with the input signature of an adjacent Web service and the output signature of a second Web service with the specified output format to ensure that each selected Web service is compatible with the adjacent Web service in the chain of Web services and the specified input and output formats, Examiner respectfully disagrees. As disclosed in the previous office action, Figure 11 is an integrated data model that shows how specific data is linked together in the system, each part representing a different data model, as disclosed in paragraph 0073. The different data models are disclosed in paragraphs 0074, 0078, 0081, and 0085, and the data models interact with the the IS platform, which provides compatibility between the inputs and outputs of different components (paragraph 0039, 0040, 0086), interpreted by the examiner to mean that the IS platform, which is configured by the user to select different services and components, provides the user with an integrated method of interacting with different data.

It is respectfully submitted that all limitations of the present application are fully covered in the Final Office Action .